

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 12, 1987

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O God, for the spirit of forgiveness in our lives, for that manner of love that transcends the barriers of anger and hatred. We pray that the suspicions and hurts of days past, those attitudes that darken our spirit, be put aside by the overwhelming power of Your reconciliation. And may we, recognizing the bonds we have together as Your people, move forward to know our potential as Your ambassadors of peace and good will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

NET WORTH CERTIFICATE PROGRAM SHOULD BE RETAINED

(Mr. ST GERMAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1987, the House passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 431. The House bill contains several important tools to help the Federal bank regulators deal with troubled financial institutions. It extends, until September 15, 1987, the authority contained in titles I and II of the Garn-St Germain Act to make emergency interstate acquisitions of closed institutions and permits the regulators to issue net worth certificates which give institutions additional time to improve their financial condition.

The bill also contains a temporary extension of the National Credit Union Administration's conservatorship and merger authority. I would like to advise Members at this point that upon completion of this bill I plan to ask unanimous consent to consider a bill that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] and I introduced to make permanent the NCUA conservatorship and merger authority.

When H.R. 431 was considered in the Senate, an amendment was adopted deleting the Net Worth Certificate Program. Net worth certificates were first authorized in the Garn-St Germain Act of 1982. Since that time, the

bank board has assisted over 120 institutions with this program.

I fail to see the wisdom of terminating net worth certificates at a time when the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is under continuing pressure.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF GARN-ST GERMAIN DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1982

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 431) to extend until September 15, 1987, the emergency acquisition and net worth guarantee provisions of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982, with Senate amendments thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Page 2, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "or section 206(a)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. WYLIE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, the chairman of the committee has already adequately explained the reason why we are here and the reason why we want H.R. 431 passed this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, in urging the amending and adoption of H.R. 431.

Mr. Speaker, the very important authorities that H.R. 431 would revive and extend expired on October 13 of last year. These authorities were originally authorized by the Garn-St Germain Act in 1982 and provide the Federal banking regulators with valuable additional tools for dealing with troubled and failing financial institutions. They include measures permitting the regulators to arrange interstate mergers of failed institutions, conservatorship authority for the National Credit Union Administration, and the Net Worth Certificate Program.

The House took action to revive and extend all of these provisions on February 4. Unfortunately, the other body has seen fit to strike the Net Worth Certificate Program. While some have expressed doubts about the effective-

ness of the Net Worth Certificate Program, I believe there is general agreement that it provides a valuable additional option—particularly for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board—in dealing with troubled institutions. Given the problems confronting the regulators, now is not the time to limit, in any fashion, the options available to the regulators. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the chairman's amendment to restore the net worth certificate provision and to support final passage of H.R. 431.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING PERMANENT CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1562) to make permanent certain authority of the National Credit Union Administration Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. WYLIE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so in order to allow the committee chairman an opportunity to explain H.R. 1562.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the ability to use conservatorships, rather than outright liquidations, has saved the credit union insurance fund substantial sums and has enabled NCUA to remedy problems within sick credit unions. Without this authority, NCUA is faced with taking drastic action to close credit unions and charge the liquidation costs to the insurance fund.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the authority for the conservatorship died last October when titles I and II of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act expired. The House passed a renewal of the act on February 4, but

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the Senate has disagreed on an unrelated section of the act.

Thus, today, we are proposing that the conservatorship authority, which is noncontroversial in both Houses, be acted on separately from the extension of the Garn-St Germain Act. Mr. Speaker, we know of no opposition to granting the NCUA this important authority, and we hope the House will agree to this bill today.

It is simply a bill to give the credit union regulator some flexibility in dealing with problem credit unions and the ability to save valuable insurance funds.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I am informed that NCUA has several credit unions that have serious problems where the conservatorship is needed. So it is important that we move expeditiously.

Mr. WYLIE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and compliment him for urging immediate passage of this bill to revive and make permanent the National Credit Union Administration's conservatorship authority.

Conservatorship authority has been extremely useful to the NCUA. This authority gives the NCUA a valuable additional option in dealing with a troubled credit union. Under the authority, rather than closing such an institution, the NCUA, as conservator, can step in with new management and keep the credit union operating while its problems are resolved. Of course, this enables the credit union to continue serving the needs of its members. The credit union's new management, can, in effect, be given breathing room to assess the situation and develop an operational plan for returning the institution to a healthy condition.

A further significant point is that conservatorship authority has saved the share insurance fund a substantial amount of money—more than \$43 million over the approximately 4-year period it was available.

Mr. Speaker, as stated earlier, the NCUA's conservatorship authority lapsed on October 13 of last year. Although H.R. 431, which the House just acted on, would revive and temporarily extend this authority until September 15, this measure to make that authority permanent is needed now. Unlike the other provisions being revived and extended in H.R. 431, credit union conservatorship authority should not be regarded as an emergency device designed to enable the NCUA to cope with time-limited difficulties. Rather, this authority will be needed and is necessary on an ongoing basis to keep the share insurance fund, which the industry itself recapitalized several years ago, a strong fund. Adoption of this measure will give the NCUA authorities comparable to those already

possessed on a permanent basis by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

There are some immediate problems confronting the NCUA which this authority would be extremely useful in resolving.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 141(a) of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982 is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (8);
(2) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (6); and
(3) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(b) No amendment made by section 141(a)(8) of the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982 to any other provision of law shall be deemed to have taken effect before the date of the enactment of this Act and any such provision of law shall be in effect as if no such amendment had taken effect before such date of enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the two pieces of legislation just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF MIGRATION AND COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 601 of Public Law 99-603, I have today appointed as members of the Commission for the Study of Migration and Cooperative Economic Development the following individuals:

Mr. Diego C. Ascencio of Washington, DC;

Ms. Donna Alvarado of Washington, DC; and

Mr. Eric H. Biddle, Jr., of Arlington, VA.

□ 1110

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if I might, I would ask to proceed for an additional minute so I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the distinguished Republican leader yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider, as we have been considering, unanimous-consent requests.

The House will not be in session tomorrow and we will meet in pro forma session on Monday.

On Tuesday the House will meet at noon, as it will on Monday, but will consider two suspension bills, H.R. 1085, to make the new GI bill permanent; and H.R. 1157, the Farm Disaster Assistance Act of 1987.

Recorded votes on suspensions debated on Tuesday will be postponed until the conclusion of the debate on the suspensions, but will be taken on Tuesday afternoon and Members should be advised that those votes will probably occur fairly early in the afternoon.

Mr. MICHEL. I think particularly so since I recall the date is one St. Patrick's Day, and generally speaking, there has not been that much attention to casting votes on that day. But I think Members would be well advised on the majority leader's comments.

Mr. FOLEY. On Wednesday, March 18, the House will meet at 2 p.m. and will consider the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act, subject to a rule.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 11 a.m. and consider House Resolution 108, committee funding resolution.

On Friday, March 20, the House will not be in session.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations, and that conference reports may be brought up at any time and a further program may be announced later.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see on the program for next week the conference report on the Highway Construction Program. I think all of us have more than passive interest in that piece of legislation.

Could the gentleman enlighten us on how the issue of the 55- to 65-mile-an-hour speed limit has been dealt with? I know it has been a controversial item. We did not have another vote here in the House, but it is my understanding there may be an opportunity through another mechanism by which a vote, or at least an expression

of the House, can be made on that issue; is that not correct?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I expect that the rule will provide for a vote, and perhaps on a separate concurrent resolution which will resolve the question of the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit by an up or down vote in the House. That is my understanding. But I think the Members should expect that there will be a separate vote on that speed limit issue.

Mr. MICHEL. Are we to assume that that vote would come on the same day on which we would take up that issue?

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up what the majority leader said. I will be one of those that will be handling the new GI bill to make it permanent. We think because it is such an important, historic piece of legislation that we will call for a vote on that suspension. I only want to mention it so that Members might be sure that they would be able to be here.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's information.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1987

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 4(a) of Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair appoints the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS, as a member of the Congressional Award Board.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL COMMISSION TO PREVENT INFANT MORTALITY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 203 of Public Law 99-660, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. ROWLAND, as a member, on the part of the House, of the National Commission To Prevent Infant Mortality.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 304 of Public Law 99-603, the Chair appoints as an additional member to the Commission on Agricultural Workers Mr. Russell Williams of Visalia, CA.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEM- BERS AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1153

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all cosponsors of H.R. 1153 be deleted. I would note, Mr. Speaker, that on today a similar piece of legislation has been introduced with slight modifications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE TRAGEDY OF YOUTH SUICIDE

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the tragedy of teenage suicide appears in front page headlines in today's newspapers. Four young people—two sisters and two young men—killed themselves yesterday by carbon monoxide poisoning. The handwritten suicide note indicates they had agreed to a suicide pact.

Suicide among young people is a personal tragedy and a growing national problem. It is a leading cause of death among our teenagers. Each year, more than 5,000 adolescents take their own lives, and perhaps as many as 50,000 more attempt suicide.

For some time, I have been bringing this problem to the attention of my colleagues. Recently, with Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. KILDEE, I introduced H.R. 457—the "Youth Suicide Prevention Act."

Our legislation establishes a program of grants to aid local suicide prevention efforts. Our modest proposal is a sound investment in saving countless young American lives.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call on all of my colleagues to join us in acting to prevent this tragic and unnecessary loss of young lives.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Congressman DON PEASE and I announced at a press conference a major new report on the Nation's unemployment compensation system that was prepared by the Northeast-Midwest Institute.

This report contained a number of fine recommendations on how we can improve our system of providing assistance to the unemployed while at the same time giving those who are out of work an incentive to participate in training programs while they still have a source of income with which to support themselves.

Our unemployment compensation system must continue to maintain those who are unemployed. But it can and should become a more active program, one that contributes to the self-efficiency of individuals and the economic health of their communities.

To that end, Congressman PEASE and I will be introducing legislation later this month to restructure our unemployment compensation system and make it easier for States to help people to help themselves.

RETHINKING THE PHILIPPINE SUGAR QUOTA

(Mr. DANIEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of visiting with Arsenio Yulo, chairman of the Philippine Sugar Regulatory Administration. Mr. Yulo is from the sugar island of Negros and has been associated with the sugar industry throughout his life. He is also a prominent attorney of law and has served as president of the Philippine Bar Association. At the request of President Corazon Aquino, Arsenio Yulo left his law practice and his sugar farm to become chairman of the Philippine Sugar Regulatory Administration. It is a job that he accepted because his country needed him and he wanted to assist President Aquino in rebuilding the Philippines and providing a better way of life for the people in the Philippine sugar industry.

Chairman Yulo was recently invited to speak at the International Sweetener Colloquium, held in Palm Springs, CA. I think it is important that not only every Member of Congress, but also all Americans be informed of the role of the Philippines as our most dependable and loyal supplier of sugar throughout history and also to the un-

fortunate way that we are now treating the Philippine sugar industry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include Arsenio Yulo's speech to the International Sweetener Colloquium for the RECORD at this time.

SPEECH BY ARSENIO B. YULO, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE SUGAR REGULATORY ADMINISTRATION

Until I was called by President Corazon Aquino to chair the new Sugar Regulatory Administration my life was devoted to actual production of sugar. I have been a sugar farmer in Negros Island for many years and, during the past year at the request of President Aquino, I took leave of my law practice to participate full time in an industry closest to my heart. I was therefore delighted when Mr. Tipton invited me to address this gathering of leaders of the U.S. sugar economy, with which the fortunes of our industry have been intertwined in the closest possible way for almost a century—and indeed for two centuries.

Sugar is only a minute part of your vast and rich economy. But in the Philippines the situation is dramatically the opposite. Sugar has been one of the cornerstones of our economic structure, and has become a significant factor in our social-political life. Consequently, whatever happens in our sugar economy is felt by a very large segment of our population and is known to all. Every move you make with respect to sugar is reported throughout the country and its implications are discussed in almost every village and hamlet. For the future of U.S.-Philippines political and cultural relations—and for the future of Democracy in Southeast Asia—it is important that you and the policy makers of this country understand this.

Let me cite a few simple economic facts. The first fact that must be brought to your attention is that in 1985 the per capita income in the Philippines was \$548, as compared with about \$17,200 in the U.S.; the second is that over half of our population of 57 million depends on agriculture for their livelihood, as compared with about 3% in your country. The sugar industry alone employed close to half a million workers, and over 3 million persons depended on the industry, directly or indirectly, for the whole or major part of their livelihood. During 1960-75 our sugar exports contributed almost 21% to the total value of our traditional exports, rising in some years to over 30%. The foreign exchange earnings of the sugar industry went a long way to pay for imports of essential foodstuffs, machinery and technical services necessary for our economic development.

These figures will give you an indication of the importance of sugar to our economy. It became so important because of the pull of the great U.S. market. You have heard about the shipload of Philippine sugar to the port of Boston in the first year of your Republic; but until the U.S. occupation of our islands at the turn of the century, nearly all of our production was non-centrifugal by scores of small family-owned mills. But the arrival in my country of U.S. capital and technology coincided with rapid expansion of U.S. consumption of sugar and this changed our sugar economy beyond recognition. Production of centrifugal sugar rose from about 50,000 tons at the end of World War I to an average of almost 1.5 million metric tons between 1930-34, of which about 1.1 million was exported, 85-90% to the U.S. Our Industry was conceived, nour-

ished and trained as an appendage to the U.S. food and drink economies. During the years 1936-38—the last representative pre-war years, and after the enactment of the first Sugar Act—U.S. consumption of sugar amounted to 6.1 million metric tons a year, of which almost 2.8 million tons was imported. Cuba supplied 1.8 million (65%), and the Philippines 870,000 tons, almost 32%. The assured market at reasonable prices—the U.S. price was only about 35% above the depressed world prices—made sugar the driving force of our economy, financing schools and universities, the urban and rural infrastructures necessary for economic development, and various industries. Sugar exports to the U.S. were for us what coffee was for Brazil.

Sugar was of critical importance in financing our reconstruction after the devastation of World War II. Notwithstanding population pressure and various social and political problems, our economic progress was steady and even impressive. We developed a class of professional people and skilled technicians which relative to population was second only to Japan's. When your Sugar Act expired at the end of 1974, we produced about 2.7 million tons, 60% of which was exported, nearly all to the U.S. To be precise: 95% of our average exports of 1.44 million tons during 1971-74 went to the U.S. I must remind you that the last expansion of our industry was undertaken, after Castro took over Cuba, at the express encouragement and even urging of the U.S. sugar authorities. Eighteen new sugar factories were built to supply the needs of the U.S. market.

But when the U.S. restored quotas in 1982, the unimaginative bureaucracy did not stop to reflect on the century-old special relationship and applied the same base period to all exporters. Indeed, they did even worse than that: they actually gave quotas to countries which had shipped only token quantities—indeed, even to countries which had not produced any until the last few years. Your officials did not take into consideration the fundamental fact that when the U.S. bought at the world price, world trading houses directed the movement of cargoes so as to reduce transportation costs. That is why Philippine shipments to the U.S. fell off. We had little control, and it would not have made economic sense to do otherwise.

I have limited my discussion to what the U.S. sugar market has meant to us, as I have assumed that you are sufficiently informed on what the Philippine connection has meant to the U.S. I will not dwell on the economic benefits you derived, on our contribution to the war effort, nor on the strategic importance in your global strategy of your air and naval bases close to the Asian mainland. These factors are known to all of you—or I hope they are. But I must at least mention the social, cultural and political aspects of the global conflict going on. It would be unbecoming of me to boast of the democratic revolution which our people have carried through—and peacefully, with hardly any bloodshed at that. Only a few days ago our people demonstrated again their devotion to Democracy and free enterprise by ratifying overwhelmingly this new Constitution. As early as today, hundreds of thousands of Filipinos will flock to EDSA Street in Manila in order to celebrate the first anniversary of the February 25 bloodless democratic revolution. But the challenges are great, both from without and within.

Because of the cuts in U.S. imports, very low world prices and internal political mis-

management we have had to cut production by 50% from the average of 2.7 million metric tons I mentioned earlier to about 1.3 million. This has created gigantic social problems in our sugar producing areas, endangering our political stability and economic reconstruction. The island of Negros, dependent on sugar for about a century, has become a hotbed of communism as jobs and food have become scarce. The people have become increasingly embittered against the U.S. and susceptible to the propaganda of the communist insurgents.

Our people are questioning the fairness of America and the sincerity of its professions of friendship. First she persuades us to invest in the production of sugar when she needs it and then abandons us. She preaches free trade and urges low income countries to open doors to imports, but shuts her own doors to imports when internal political pressures are applied. I must state frankly that if unemployment, poverty and loss of hope bring discouragement to our people, the reverberations would spread to the whole Pacific rim of Asia.

Last year, as you know, your Congress tried to undo some of the injustice and damage, and we are deeply grateful for its efforts. Indeed, we were given hopes of further ameliorations. But during the course of the year it gradually became evident that we are facing an entirely new situation which puts into shade the issue of quota distribution. We are facing the prospect of a rapid decline in total U.S. imports—to zero in two years, according to your Secretary of Agriculture. Whether the U.S. becomes self-sufficient in sweeteners in two years or in five is of little moment; what is important is the logic of the economic forces which the new farm law has created. Absurd as it may sound, these forces, if unchanged, could even make you an exporter of sugar, with the cost of the tremendous subsidies borne by the helpless consumer or taxpayer. A wise and experienced statesman, Senor Jorge Zorregieta, who presided over the 1982-83 International Sugar Conference, and who is here, I'm happy to say, stated with great perspicacity at your last Colloquium, "Funny or absurd though it may seem, we may wonder if the U.S. will not eventually become a surplus producer, which will have to export somehow. We have to remember when the EEC set, at one point, the price of many products (among which was beef, a clear import) it did not have the intention of becoming the important beef exporter it is today. In other words, experience should show us that the same causes sometimes lead to the same effects, even when they are unwanted." I can tell you with absolute certainty that in the EEC, too, neither governments, nor Brussels, nor the industry leaders, foresaw net exports. The most audacious industry leaders spoke of self-sufficiency. But five years or so after prices were raised, the EEC was exporting about 3 million tons net, consumers were paying high prices, and export subsidies cost \$200 or \$300 million a year.

As did the EEC, you have made sugar production more profitable than almost any other important crop, and you cannot blame farmers for taking advantage of the opportunity, if permitted to do so. At the same time, the high price discourages consumption of sugar and constitutes a tax on the public at large. The consumer loss is estimated by the Council of Economic Advisors at \$1.1-\$1.8 billion even after allowing for the higher world prices that would result from greater U.S. imports. But if you in-

clude the higher cost of HFCS than would otherwise be the case, the tax is probably closer to \$3 billion. If production is encouraged and consumption falls, there is only one way to cope with the surpluses when the lines cross.

Your policy makers must reflect on what the new sugar law will do to our economy—and indeed to the economies of the low-income sugar exporters in Asia and Latin America. As President Reagan's last Economic Report points out, the protectionist sugar policies of industrialized countries cost the low income sugar exporters \$7.4 billion in lost revenue in 1983, and reduced their real income by about \$2.1 billion. These policies also increased price instability in the residual world market by approximately 25%. Your effort to reduce the damage by food donations may be a balm to a guilty conscience but it is no solution to the unemployment and balance of payments which you are creating for us. Exact calculations are difficult; but I am certain for every job which your protectionist policy creates in the U.S., four or five jobs are lost in my country or in other low-income sugar exporting countries. Moreover, in a diversified and highly developed economy such as yours the loss of jobs in one sector need not be a disaster. Not so in my country which depends so much on agriculture and where alternative crops are so difficult to find. I wish your agricultural experts would find suitable alternatives and tell us.

There are many ways for you to correct the course, without imposing unjust hardships on your farmers. Under the older Sugar Acts you combined production discipline, price moderation and protection of vital foreign policy interests, and I am sure you can do that again. If you are going to have quotas you need to analyze realistically how they are to be distributed to accomplish your essential political and social objectives. I am sure that the Philippines would rank high in any such approach.

Your development of a more open and far-sighted domestic policy could be as a lever for negotiating similar policy objectives with other countries, both importers and exporters. As you know, discussions are going on about a conference to negotiate a new ISA to stabilize the world price in a range that would cover costs for efficient exporters. An offer by the U.S. to reduce protection so as to provide greater access for imports would be a most effective bargaining chip in negotiating with the EEC and the Big Four exporters generally. The "elephants," as they have been called, have become greatly worn over the long-term effects of the new U.S. sugar legislation.

Moreover, a change in direction by the U.S. would provide a basis for negotiating access changes by Japan, Sweden, Switzerland and other high income countries which are maintaining absurdly high sugar prices to protect domestic producers, to derive revenue and/or, to some, foreign exchange. The latest USDA report on retail food prices in 15 world capitals shows that in Tokyo the price for sugar was \$1.50 a kg., 75-80 cents in Washington, and 33 cents in Ottawa. Even the Ottawa price gave some protection to domestic producers, but it is exemplary, in comparison with prices in other high income countries, in reasonableness and consideration of the interest of low income efficient exporters.

An ISA could be of considerable value to you in preventing a price explosion on the world market, from the effects of which even self-sufficiency would not isolate you. I

note that Mr. Fry predicted yesterday an explosion in 1988-89. I am sure that effective stock provisions could be set out and negotiated for coping with normal production fluctuations. Experience shows that careful drafting by practical market people would be necessary to forestall loopholes; but I am confident that the overwhelming majority of major exporters would cooperate honestly in the endeavour and implementation. As to the Philippines, we are prepared to give you categorical supply guarantees at reasonable prices, whether in the context of an ISA or in bilateral negotiations. Our long term interest lies in promoting sugar consumption in this country, not in exploitation of emergencies.

I hope I can make you realize the urgency of this matter. The longer you wait the deeper interests vested in excessive protection become entrenched, while the economic, social and political damage on the other side becomes more difficult to repair.

I wish to convey to all the greetings of our beloved President Corazon Aquino and the Filipino people.

Thank you.

□ 1120

IN HONOR OF JAMES MADISON

(Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the home of our fourth President, James Madison, is the only home among those of our Nation's Founding Fathers that is not at this time open to the public. That will all change on March 16, Madison's 236th birthday, when Montpelier in Orange County, VA, is finally opened to the public after a thorough renovation project.

The efforts of James Madison in the framing of our Constitution have rightly earned him the title of the "Father of the Constitution," and it is only fitting that we should celebrate the opening of his historic home to the public during our year-long celebration of the bicentennial of the signing of that great document.

It is my hope that through both the bicentennial and the opening of Montpelier Americans will gain a greater understanding of the significant contributions made to our system of government by James Madison.

In addition to his two terms of service as our President and authorship of a significant portion of the Constitution, Madison was a Member of this body during the first session of Congress in 1789 and was the leading proponent of his time for religious freedom in our country, which culminated in the adoption of his first amendment to the Constitution establishing religious liberty in the United States.

On March 15 there will be a public celebration at Montpelier in honor of this great patriot and the opening of his historic home. I certainly commend this event to my colleagues.

REAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM MUST ADDRESS OVERALL EXPENDITURES

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see congressional interest in campaign finance reform. I feel, however, any proposal that fails to address the fundamental problem of limiting overall spending will fall short of real reform.

An estimated \$425 million was spent in the 1986 congressional races—up 3½ times since 1976. The average cost for a winning House candidate rose from \$87,209 in 1976 to \$346,000 in 1986. Where will the spending cyclone stop?

Contributions and expenditures produce political speech which is entitled to first amendment protection. In the Buckley versus Valeo decision, the court ruled legislation regulating campaign expenditures must be balanced by a sufficiently strong governmental interest. I believe that the fundamental interest in the institutional integrity of the Congress asserts such an interest—and have organized a task force to examine the issue.

My task force is chaired by Leon Billings, former executive director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and former administrative assistant to Senator Edmund Muskie. The primary focus of the task force will be to examine options to enact a limit on campaign expenditures, including the use of the House rules. I urge my colleagues to join me in restoring public confidence in our campaign finance system by enacting comprehensive reform which includes expenditure limits.

AN EXTRA MEASURE OF PROTECTION FOR PRISON GUARDS

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, prison guards must patrol unarmed among the prisoners in our overcrowded correctional facilities because they are so vulnerable that a pistol or shotgun could be taken from them in the course of an escape attempt or prison protest. For the same reason, the guards are locked in the cell blocks without a key.

Unlike the guards, however, some of the prisoners are armed, having secretly fashioned homemade knives which they keep hidden.

What is there to deter prisoners serving life terms from murdering prison guards, or for that matter, other prisoners? After all, they are already serving the maximum sentence.

We must protect our prison guards by providing better deterrence.

Accordingly, I am reintroducing legislation to establish capital punishment for Federal prisoners serving life terms who commit first degree murder.

I have offered this legislation in previous Congresses without success. Let's pass it this time, and give our prison guards the extra measure of protection they deserve.

FDA DEREGULATION OF DRUGS FOR TERMINALLY ILL NOT WITHOUT DRAWBACKS

(Mr. BOSCO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, many of us have felt the frustration of terminally ill friends or loved-ones not being able to use reported wonder drugs that may have a chance of curing them. The argument goes, if the patient is going to die anyway, why not let him take anything he wants because he'll be no worse off if the drug doesn't work.

The Reagan administration has in effect taken this stance in proposed regulatory changes that would allow drugs to be sold to terminally ill patients even if there is no evidence whatsoever that such drugs are effective.

This deregulation, while ostensibly providing comfort to the terminally ill, is likely in the long run to reduce confidence in pharmaceuticals and provide a whole new market for snake oil and cures, the advertising of which will appeal to some of the most vulnerable people in our society. People will be given false hope, encouraged by rumor to make guinea pigs of themselves, perhaps abandoning hopeful treatments for well advertised miracle cures.

However frustrating it may be, I encourage the FDA to keep effectiveness as a criteria for the marketing and use of drugs. Yes, allow fast tracking of promising cures. Yes, allow clinical experimentation when warranted. But don't subject any class of people, especially those most in need of hope, to be preyed upon by tent show chautauquas, chemical charlatans that will undermine confidence in all medicine by promising effectiveness where none exists.

THE RUDE AWAKENING COMES WHEN OUR PEOPLE LOSE FAITH IN THE CURRENCY

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is pleading impotence when

trying to deal with the burgeoning budget deficit, and is trying to use the dollar as a whipping boy for our horrendous trade deficit. A lot of people are complacent that our deficits will run their course and when they get severe enough, and inflation starts snowballing again, more economy-minded politicians will be returned to Washington at the next election who will set matters right once more.

History does not confirm this assumption. On the contrary, history is replete with examples where if a serious crash occurs, the rabble-rousers move in. When a serious monetary crisis occurs, your chances of a socialistic form of government are at least 10-to-1 stronger than the possibility of your getting an economy-minded government. Just think of the rise of Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler, Mao, and the causes of their assumption of power, and you will recognize that continued monetary debasement lay the foundation stone for dictatorship, socialism, and regulated peoples. Those who slumber in the belief that a continuation of prodigality will hasten the return of common sense in Washington are due for a rude awakening if we ever reach the point when our people lose faith in the currency. It is at that time that we will realize we may have lost the representative form of government that has made us the Nation we are.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, an urgent note sent in the winter of 1947 by the Government of Prime Minister Clement Attlee informed the American Government that Britannia could no longer provide aid to Greece and Turkey. The English, exhausted and financially broke after their 6-year struggle against Hitler's Germany, had passed the baton of world leadership to the United States.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson outlined the seriousness of the problem in the eastern Mediterranean in a meeting at the White House with the congressional leadership. In Greece, 20,000 Communist guerrillas threatened to overthrow the ruling government coalition; in Turkey, Stalin was demanding bases and rights to the Dardanelles. Without assistance from the United States those two countries would slip behind the Iron Curtain.

After a long pause, Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, turned to the President and said, "Mr. President, if you will say that to the Congress and the country I will sup-

port you, and I believe that most of its members will do the same."

Forty years ago today President Harry Truman told a joint session of Congress that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." He requested \$400 million in economic and military aid for Greece and Turkey.

To commemorate this occasion I am introducing a resolution that calls upon the House of Representatives to observe May 22, 1987, the date when the Greco-Turkish aid bill was signed into law, as a day to honor the achievements of the Greek, Turkish, and American peoples in our common commitment to the ideals of democracy.

INTRODUCING THE TENDER OFFER REFORM ACT OF 1987

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago, a corporate takeover attempt would make all of the front pages of the newspapers. Today, however, takeover attempts are so commonplace that they are reported on the back pages of the business section.

In spite of our acceptance of takeovers as everyday occurrences, there are 55 million shareholders who have to solve the mysteries of a tender offer when it is their turn to decide whether to sell their shares.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Tender Offer Reform Act of 1987. My bill will broaden the disclosure aspects of the securities laws, give shareholders more time to consider a tender offer, and place restrictions on greenmail.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal written and seen about effects on various communities including Findlay, OH; Bartlesville, OK; Toledo, OH; Pittsburgh, PA; and Akron, OH, just to name a few. My bill also deals with the community impact of those takeover attempts.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has been studying takeovers, and my legislation will go a long way in taking some of the mysteries and gamesmanship out of the process.

□ 1130

REAUTHORIZING THE CHILD SURVIVAL FUND

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out that earlier this morning the House

Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations adopted three amendments I offered to reauthorize, expand, and fine tune the operations of the child survival fund.

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment that I offered today, reauthorizes the program and boosts its budget authority to \$80 million in fiscal year 1988 and \$90 million in fiscal year 1989—for a total of \$170 million over 2 years.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the child survival fund was slated for zero funding and I, with the strong support of Chairman YATRON, offered an amendment to reauthorize the program and double its budget authority. That amendment was adopted by our subcommittee, as well as the full committee and later by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the work financed through the child survival fund is today saving millions of innocent lives. In their report on the "State of the World's Children," UNICEF pointed out that in the last 12 months the lives of an estimated 1.5 million children under the age of 5 have been saved. In the last 5 years, over 4 million children have been saved.

Mr. Speaker, without our continued help, through the child survival fund, children will go on being the victims of treatable and preventable ailments such as the measles, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, and diarrheal dehydration. But with sustained assistance, millions of children can be saved and the quality of their lives substantially improved for a modest investment. The reauthorization of the child survival fund, with expanded budget authority, will ensure that the low-cost, but life saving techniques—such as immunizations, oral rehydration therapy, breast feeding and growth monitoring—can be brought to more children and thus save more lives.

Mr. Speaker, the second amendment I offered today gives AID the flexibility to participate and promote child survival programs in countries that are for various political reasons currently proscribed from receiving U.S. assistance. Countries that immediately come to mind are Brazil, Peru, Liberia, and Tanzania where AID sees a great need and a potential for protecting millions of kids.

I would point out to my colleague Mr. Speaker, that a third of the approximately 1 million children who die each year in Central and South America are Brazilian and more than 50 percent of Brazil's children suffer some degree of disease or malnutrition. In August 1985, the new civilian government and the Catholic Church launched a major initiative to immunize the children and drastically reduce the nation's child deaths by 1990.

When the program was launched, Mr. Speaker, U.S. AID was eager to support the program. Unfortunately, however, because of restrictions in U.S. law, our support programs have been forced to stay out of the Brazilian immunization project. There is still much work to be done in Brazil and AID would like to be able to lend their expertise and technical assistance. My amendment, Mr. Speaker, will permit them to do so.

Members should know that in drafting this second amendment I took the precaution and consulted with AID, as well as legislative counsel, to ensure that Communist countries, countries who have severed diplomatic ties with the United States, and countries which support terrorist activities will not get any support because of my amendment. The amendment is narrowly targeted at those countries which are poised to receive AID child survival assistance and those which AID desires to help. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the administration supports this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the third amendment adopted today, will enable AID to use funds to reimburse either the Public Health Service or the Centers for Disease Control for technical and professional personnel they may assign to immunization or ORT activities both in the United States and at AID's field missions.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment continues the authority that was previously granted in the fiscal year 1987 continuing budget resolution. That is due to expire at the end of the fiscal year. In my consultations with AID, it became clear that the extension was needed.

I would note that our committee is on record supporting an expansion of the technical expertise available to AID in the health field. My amendment will ensure that this considerable expertise is available and put to work on immunization projects. By making the reimbursement authority part of the Foreign Assistance Act, rather than part of the annual appropriations legislation, we will be providing AID with ability to make long-term arrangements with the CDC and PHS regarding the detail of personnel. Like the previous amendment, Mr. Speaker, this amendment also has the support of the administration.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say, that none of us here can fully appreciate the suffering that millions of children needlessly endure because of a lack of access to the components of the child survival fund. I firmly believe that these three amendments offered and accepted today ensure that the techniques of child survival reach millions of children, and will ultimately serve to alleviate suffering, hardship, and pain.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1987 (Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Child Support Enforcement Improvement Act of 1987. This bill will significantly strengthen our current child support enforcement legislation and at no additional cost to the Federal Government.

Two and a half years ago, Congress overwhelmingly approved and the President signed landmark legislation that represented a sea change in Federal policy on this subject. The Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 put the Federal Government firmly on record that child support is not a voluntary commitment, but a legal as well as a moral obligation. In effect the amendments established a premise: The U.S. Congress would no longer turn its back on the children who are being deprived of their legal financial support.

The time has come for Congress to be serious about reforming our national welfare system. Clearly, a strengthened child support enforcement program to protect against family after family from falling onto the welfare rolls must be a major part of any reform. In this respect, this legislation is a "welfare prevention" measure.

My bill will strengthen the Federal role in child support by making five major changes in current law.

It requires mandatory withholding of wages from the time a legal child support decree is ordered, rather than allowing for any period of delinquency before withholding begins. I fought for this key provision when we deliberated over the 1984 amendments and I believe the need for universal withholding is clearer. Waiting for up to 30 days default on payments creates real hardship—children are deprived. Realistically, before the catchup occurs experience shows that it is not uncommon for months to pass before payments are made. This brings emotional and physical stress upon the family. The bills do not stop and the real needs of the children, and food and clothing, still must be met. Many fathers will eventually pay when the money is dragged out of them. Why delay the inevitable?

New Jersey officials state that even though New Jersey law allows for a period of only 14 days before withholding occurs, immediate wage withholding is necessary. These officials state that by the time the employer is located, the noncustodial parent is found and notified of action, and appeals are exhausted, it is months before the wages are actually withheld. This is months, not days, that a

child is denied the basic necessities of life. New Jersey estimates that about \$20 million is lost in child support payment during this time—and we are only talking about AFDC cases here. The amount would be significantly greater if non-AFDC cases are included. Other State officials have expressed similar views. Many say it is months before any child support is received.

Mandatory wage withholding would relieve some pressure from the crowded court docket and allow State agencies to operate more efficiently and effectively. In addition, the use of universal withholding would standardize our system throughout the Nation, providing an important tool for interstate enforcement. And, I must stress that varying delinquency provisions add unnecessary confusion to the interstate enforcement efforts.

Second, my bill would require the courts to use State-established guidelines for determining the amount of child support the noncustodial parent should provide.

The 1984 amendments required States to develop these guidelines, but allowed them to be advisory in nature only. No longer should it be possible that two judges in the same county courthouse could hand down widely different support orders for families in identical financial situations.

Under this legislation, the States' support guidelines would be binding on all courts and noncustodial parents would be required to prove why there should be any deviation from them—the legal doctrine of rebuttable presumption. The 1984 amendments required guidelines to be developed. We must now require that they be followed. Only 14 States have set up rebuttable presumption guidelines.

Third, this legislation will mandate States to review and, where necessary, update individual child support orders to ensure their compliance with the State support guidelines. Child support payments must be periodically updated to reflect rising cost of living and any upward or downward movement in the absent parent's income.

However, it is the unfortunate truth that all the guidelines and child support order reviews in the world will not help that family whose father has skipped across State lines to avoid paying support. To strengthen all-important interstate collection efforts, my bill would allow the Federal Parent Locator System [FPLS] or State child support agency direct access to employment security information through nationwide data exchange networks already in operation. Currently, child support agencies have only indirect access to these networks. By allowing direct access to these data, we can provide another tool to FPLS and the child support agencies to assist with interstate enforcement.

Just as is used presently in the IRS intercept, there have been other precedents. The Federal Parent Locator Service and State child support agencies currently have access to IRS, Social Security, Veterans', Selective Service, Defense Department, and National Personnel Records Center information. There is no reason why they should not be given access to important employment security information. This information, now available in an indirect State-by-State manner, will be very useful in interstate child support enforcement cases—which are 30 percent of all child support cases in this country.

These data exchange networks will help with interstate wage withholding. The only way a State will withhold wages from a noncustodial parent in another State is if the requesting State provides information on the address of the employer and the noncustodial parent. Many States do not have this information. By gaining direct access to this system, they will be able to get this information for use in interstate cases.

Child support enforcement agencies and the Federal Parent Locator Service will be required to protect against unauthorized disclosure of this information. Furthermore, in order to offset any costs to this system, they will be required to reimburse these networks for their information.

Finally, my legislation would increase penalties to the States that do not comply with the federally mandated portions of child support law. Only through stiffer enforced sanctions, will reluctant States recognize the importance the Federal Government has placed on this program.

I firmly believe that in order for our child support enforcement system to work, it must be as easy for the States and the legal system to administer as possible. In summary, these reforms would relieve the crowded court dockets, use existing State agencies as effectively as possible, and keep many families from tumbling onto the welfare rolls.

No mother, no child, no family should have to bear the burden of endless expensive, debasing, and destructive legal battles before they can receive the child support to which they are legally entitled. Child support is not a voluntary commitment. It is a legal obligation which all levels of government have responsibility to uphold.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

[Excerpt from "A Decade of Child Support Enforcement 1975-1985" Tenth Annual Report to Congress for the Period Ending September 30, 1985, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services]

I. DIMENSIONS OF NONSUPPORT

The Federal Government has been stimulating and encouraging improvements in child support enforcement for 10 years

through the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) program.

During the program's 10 years of operation, the American family has been dramatically altered under the impact of divorce and out-of-wedlock births. The duty to support children, a basic obligation of parenthood, has been seriously weakened.

According to the 1983 Current Population Survey on Child Support and Alimony, conducted by the Census Bureau, 8.7 million women were caring for children whose fathers were absent from the home. Only 58 percent of them had court orders or agreements to receive child support and even of this relatively fortunate group who were actually supposed to receive payments in 1983, half received just partial payment or no payment at all during the course of the year. The unpaid child support bill for 1983 alone: \$3 billion. Moreover, the average amount of child support received by a family in 1983 was only \$2,341. "These figures," said former HHS Secretary Margaret M. Heckler, "document a widespread and shameful situation in our country—the non-support of children by their own parents."

8.7 million women in 1983 with children under 21 where the father was not present: Of 42 percent, no support awarded. Of 50 percent support awarded, 50.5 percent full amount received; of 25.5 percent, less than full amount received; of 24 percent, nothing received.

Note.—From 1983 Census Bureau Survey.

One-half of marriages that took place in the 1970's will end in divorce. Out-of-wedlock births as a proportion of live births climbed from less than 11 percent in 1970 to about 20 percent in 1982. As a result, the plight of the single-parent family—90 percent of them headed by women—has become a familiar feature on the landscape of American society. The median annual income of female-headed families in 1983 was \$12,800 and fully one-third of these families were poor. The brunt of this poverty falls on the children. The Census Bureau found that in 1983, 55 percent of children living in female-headed households were poor—four times the rate for children in other households. Clearly, the financial abandonment of children by one parent contributes significantly to their poverty.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,
Trenton, NJ, March 2, 1987.

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROUKEMA: Knowing of your interest in child support enforcement, I would like to share with you our recommendations for changes at the federal level to strengthen this system. These proposals would result in enormous savings in welfare expenditures for the state, counties and the federal government and a higher standard of living for children living in single parent households.

The following summarizes projects we have initiated or plan to initiate in the near future and the need for federal legislation:

1. ESTABLISHMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES

Last year the New Jersey Supreme Court released guidelines which are based on a concept called "income shares" that allocates the proportion of disposable income that normally would have been spent on the children of an intact family. We anticipate that these guidelines could more than

double child support orders in New Jersey. Persons with incomes below the poverty level will not be subject to the guidelines but will be required to pay a nominal amount.

Federal action needed

Because of the demonstrated success of this program, we propose that states be required to comply with child support guidelines as a matter of law, held to the irrep- arable harm standard.

2. UPWARD MODIFICATION OF CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS

In July 1985, we conducted a pilot project in one of our counties to determine whether prior child support orders were in compliance with the new child support guidelines. Because we found such enormous discrepancy between the orders and the amount the absent parents should pay, we extended this project to 19 of the 21 counties.

We have reviewed about 1500 cases which has resulted in increasing child support orders from \$2.2 million to \$4.9 million, a 130 percent increase. This represents only about three percent of the 50,000 absent parents with children on welfare who we estimate have incomes below the guidelines. About 26.3 percent of the AFDC cases were closed due to the increase in the child support collections.

Furthermore, we have found that, contrary to popular belief, most of the obligors have incomes high enough to pay their fair share of child support. A review of 650 cases in seven counties found that the average annual gross salary of the obligor was \$20,266. Also, virtually all of the cases had health insurance which possibly could be available to the children.

Federal action needed

We propose that states be required to modify child support orders on a regular basis in compliance with specific income guidelines. States should be permitted to do this administratively rather than through the courts. This would reduce administrative costs and increase the number of cases which can be processed.

3. PRIORITIZATION OF CHILD SUPPORT CASES

Currently, federal law requires that we treat all child support cases the same. However, we would like to give priority to those cases in which the custodial parent is participating in REACH.

Under the current system, if a welfare client accepts a job at or slightly above the minimum wage, this individual will suffer a substantial loss in AFDC payments and Medicaid coverage. This results in a disincentive to accept training or entry-level employment. If we were permitted to target our enforcement efforts toward the absent parent in those cases, we could increase the welfare client's total income and assuage her fear that wages from a job would not be sufficient to compensate her for lost welfare benefits.

Federal action needed

The Secretary should be granted clear authority to grant waivers to states that want to target their child support enforcement resources towards cases which will reduce welfare dependency.

4. IMMEDIATE INCOME WITHHOLDING

As part of our welfare reform initiative, we will request state legislation which will result in automatic immediate wage withholding in child support cases at the time the order is issued. The current federal requirement is that wages are withheld when

the obligor is 30 days in arrears. The requirement in New Jersey is 14 days, yet we have found that this more stringent standard is also inadequate.

The reason is that by the time we locate the employer, find the obligor, notify him and wait for a response and the exhaustion of all of his administrative appeals, it is months before the wages are actually withheld. During that period we estimate that about \$20 million is lost in New Jersey in child support payments. Furthermore, this estimate applies only to AFDC cases. If non-AFDC cases were included, the impact would be even greater.

It is clear that the current system is not working. It is costly, ineffective, and unfair to the child who is denied the basic necessities of life for months at a time. Furthermore, the current system reinforces the attitude that wages withholding is a stigma which it should not be.

Federal action needed

While we plan to initiate this change in New Jersey our success will be limited because 30 percent of all absent fathers owing child support reside in other states. This is an interstate issue which can only be fully addressed at the national level. The federal government should require that wage withholding be automatic for all adjudicated cases at the time an order is entered without the need for presumption of default.

5. SPECIAL PROJECTS TO REDUCE WELFARE DEPENDENCY AMONG TEENAGE PARENTS

The Department has been awarded \$1.9 million from the Office of Family Assistance for a program to reduce long term welfare dependency among teenage parents in Camden and Newark. An innovative component of the program will be that teenage fathers will also be required to participate in job training or attend school in order to receive other welfare benefits such as AFDC, food stamps or general assistance. This should result in increasing child support collections.

Federal action needed

States should be permitted to make special efforts to enroll fathers in AFDC or food stamp employment and training programs when the custodial parent and child are also on public assistance.

In conclusion, in order to assist New Jersey and other states to obtain the support children are entitled to, we ask that states be required to comply with child support guidelines as a matter of law; be permitted to modify child support orders administratively to reflect increased earnings of the obligor; be granted the flexibility to prioritize cases to reduce welfare dependency; and that all states be required to withhold wages at the time an order is entered.

Please let me know if I can provide any further assistance. Also, feel free to contact Raymond Castro, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Relations, should you or your staff have any questions. I hope we can meet sometime soon in Washington to discuss this matter and other human services issues that affect our state.

Sincerely,

DREW ALTMAN, Ph.D.,
Commissioner.

[Excerpt from the Interim Report, June 7, 1985, of the Advisory Panel Child Support Models Project, "Development of Guidelines for Establishing and Updating Child Support Orders"]

USE OF FORMULAS

A formula should be used as a rebuttable presumption for the establishment of child support. Any formula should be applicable to a broad range of circumstances. We recognize, however, that there are individual cases in which the rigid application of a formula would lead to inequitable results to one of the parents or the child in question. Examples of such cases might include a terminally ill obligor, a child with unusual educational or social needs, or an emancipated seventeen year old child. In addition, experience in several states has suggested that application of formulas is most difficult at both extremes of the income range. At very low levels of obligor income, ability to pay must be carefully scrutinized in relation to obligor subsistence needs. At high parental income levels (e.g. \$50,000 per year or more), child support levels are significantly affected by tax considerations and trade-offs between other elements of an overall divorce settlement, such as property division and spousal maintenance.

As a rebuttable presumption, a formula should be used to set the amount of child support unless one party can demonstrate that its use would lead to an inequitable outcome, or unless the court or administrative agency so determines. In either case, a departure from the formula should be accompanied by a written statement which gives the reasons for deviating from the formula's direct application.

Although the primary use of a formula is to guide the parties and adjudicatory authority (courts or child support enforcement agencies with administrative process) in establishing the level of child support awards, a formula can and should be used to review the levels of negotiated child support amounts as well. Although negotiated settlements are currently given only cursory review by most courts and administrative agencies, such practices do not always adequately protect the interests of the child, who is generally not directly represented in the context of an adversary proceeding between the parents. Thus, an important use of a formula would be to assess the adequacy of negotiated child support settlements in providing for the economic need of children.

TRUTH IN ADVERTISING NEEDED FOR TRUST FUNDS; FEDERAL DEFICIT IS MUCH BIGGER THAN REPORTED

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, it's time for some truth in advertising about deficits and truth in lending about what we are doing with the Government's trust fund surpluses. It's time to be honest.

We keep hearing about how much progress we are making in reducing the deficit from its record highs of \$212 billion in 1985, \$221 billion in 1986, to an estimated \$174 billion defi-

cit in 1987, and an estimated \$169 billion deficit in 1988. The truth is that a major reason for these alleged reductions in deficits is increased borrowing from trust fund surpluses, including temporary Social Security surpluses; all of which must be paid back with interest.

CBO projects that the 1987 budget deficit will be \$174 billion. Accepting that conservative estimate as accurate—which few people do—what is not commonly known is that the general fund in 1987 will have to borrow an additional \$19 billion of surplus 1987 Social Security trust funds, along with over \$50 billion from other 1987 trust fund surpluses, in order to achieve that estimate.

Thus, Uncle Sam's total borrowing in 1987 and its true 1987 deficit, will be an estimated \$244 billion, not the \$174 billion CBO reports as its 1987 budget deficit.

It appears that budget deficits under our budget rules are not the same as total borrowing required to enable the general fund to pay all its expenses in 1987. The unhappy truth about the real amount of Federal borrowing in 1987 and the real deficit of 1987 is avoided under our budget rules by simply classifying trust fund surpluses, for budgetary purposes, as "revenues," with no mention of such surpluses being borrowed and spent by the general fund. Of course, borrowing by any other name, or with no name at all, smells, like the rose, just the same. And what is borrowed, from whatever source, must be repaid—with interest. That, alas, is an economic truth that won't go away.

The story is the same with CBO's assumption of a reduced Federal budget deficit of \$169 billion in 1988—only worse. What hasn't been told is that in arriving at the 1988 estimate of a \$169 billion deficit, \$36 billion must be borrowed from the Social Security trust fund surplus as well as an additional \$70 billion from other 1988 trust fund surpluses. That's a whopping total of an additional \$106 billion of unpublicized borrowing from public surplus trust funds in 1988. Add this to CBO's official 1988 budget deficit estimate of \$169 billion and you have a true 1988 deficit estimate of \$275 billion.

I'm not saying that trust fund surpluses should not necessarily be loaned to the general fund. An IOU from Uncle Sam, with reasonable interest, should be as good an investment as one made in the private sector. But we should let the public and the trust fund beneficiaries know about the borrowing and spending of their trust fund surpluses and when and how we expect the debt-ridden general fund to raise sufficient revenues to pay it back.

More importantly, we should make it clear that borrowing by the general fund of trust funds increases the

annual deficit as much as it increases the national debt. And sooner or later taxes must be raised to pay back such loans, with interest.

We should also understand that Social Security payroll taxes will be increased by 5.8 percent in 1988—a \$14 billion hike. All of this \$14 billion increase in 1988 revenues will be borrowed by the general fund yet not added to that year's annual deficit. Thus, it will make the official 1988 deficit appear \$14 billion smaller.

Truth in lending and truth in advertising is something Congress talks a lot about. It should practice it, too.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH ARROGANCE

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to a classic case of executive branch arrogance. In the March 6 Federal Register the Department of Housing and Urban Development declares that it is canceling the next round of urban action development grants. HUD claims the cancellation is proper because the President's request for a rescission of \$225 million of UDAG fiscal year 1987 funding is awaiting congressional action.

The law requires congressional approval to institute a rescission. Inaction is rejection. HUD knows that. Congress refused to endorse a similar rescission request last year. HUD knows that, too.

There will be no approval of the rescission this year. HUD also knows that.

And consider the timing. The rescission request expires March 15. The final date for applications for the grants was not until March 31. Yet HUD declares its cancellation of the grants on March 6. Why not wait the 9 days until the rescission is clearly dead?

Plainly, this is a classic case with the executive branch seeking to force a deferral on the Congress without approval, in violation of law.

U.N. TURNS DOWN U.S. RESOLUTION ON CUBA'S HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

(Mr. SHUMWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, last week I was pleased to join with over 40 of my colleagues in introducing a resolution condemning the human rights abuses of Castro's Cuba and calling on the United Nations to place Cuba

among the highest priorities of its human rights agenda.

Yesterday the United Nations Human Rights Commission failed to live up to its noble mandate and at the same time it failed the 15,000 political prisoners who languish in Cuban prisons. An effort led by India, which claims to be a nonaligned country, succeeded in preventing consideration of a United States resolution condemning Cuba, one of the world's worst offenders of basic rights and freedoms. As indicated in the article which follows, the motion failed by a vote of 19 to 18 with 6 abstentions.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1987]

U.S. RESOLUTION ON CUBA AT U.N. FAILS TO CARRY

GENEVA, March 11.—An effort led by India and supported by Latin American countries prevented the United States from putting its motion condemning Cuba for human rights violations to a vote before the U.N. Human Rights Commission today.

Ambassador E. Robert Wallach vowed a renewed effort next year. The commission session formally closes Thursday.

The U.S. resolution would have condemned Cuba, saying it holds thousands of political prisoners. India countered with a resolution saying the issue of Cuba "should not be debated at this time." It was adopted by 19 votes, including those of Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Nicaragua, Argentina and Mexico, to 18, with six abstentions.

Wallach later told a news conference he had information from the U.S. Embassy in Caracas that the Venezuelan delegation had been told to change its vote and abstain but did not get its instructions in time. "The vote would have been an 18-to-18 tie and our motion would have gotten to the floor," Wallach said.

Wallach praised France for voting against the Indian resolution and thus, by implication, for the United States. French sources said earlier that Cuban President Fidel Castro had phoned President Francois Mitterrand asking him not to support the U.S. position but that Mitterrand had turned him down.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE WOODROW "WOODY" HAYES

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness this morning that, in the sports world and also particularly in Ohio, most particularly in Columbus, OH, we learned of the death of a real giant, Coach Woody Hayes.

We all, of course, know Coach Hayes for his great accomplishments and achievements on the football field; two national championships, 13 Big Ten titles, 9 Rose Bowls, and of course he did all of this with a spotless record and really was the standard for how to run a football program in America.

But I have to tell you that the people in Columbus, the people in Ohio do not think of Woody Hayes only as a great football coach. We

really think of Woody Hayes as a great humanitarian.

He traveled around the world visiting servicemen on ships, in the fields; was part of the Bob Hope tour at one point. We remember Woody Hayes for going to Children's Hospital, where he would go from bed to bed, spending time with the little children right in Columbus, OH, or to the veterans hospitals, or the charities that he was involved in and sponsored actively on literally almost a week-to-week basis.

He represented Presidents and Vice Presidents around the world because they had so much respect for Woody Hayes. The sports world is going to miss Woody Hayes. I know that his players are going to miss Woody Hayes a great deal. But I have got to tell you that personally I am going to miss him, and I know the people in Columbus, OH, not only love him, respect him, but will never forget the great achievements, the great accomplishments and the great unselfishness that Woody Hayes gave us in this world.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for taking the time this morning.

All of us were shocked, Mr. Speaker, and saddened at Woody's loss. Woody was in the Washington area just last summer for the Lombardi cancer tournament. And was, while not a golfing participant, was there to accept an award from the Lombardi tournament.

I had a chance to talk with him at that point. A lot of people, of course, will remember Woody for only one thing. It is unfortunate that that is the case.

I saw the story this morning on the news and could not help but think that all the years he gave to the university and to the State of Ohio that it would come down to only one thing. I am glad the gentleman took this time to point out some of the great things Woody has done over the years: a Denison graduate, he coached at Miami University, my alma mater, and then came on to Ohio State, where his record was unsurpassed.

We will miss him dearly. He was indeed a great Ohioan, a great football coach and a great American. All of us share our sadness with his family, his son Steve, his wife Ann, all of those people that loved Woody will miss him greatly.

Again, we appreciate your taking the time to honor Woody this morning.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I will be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKENS].

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and privilege to know Woody Hayes for, I guess, over 30 years now. Having been on campus and worked under Woody, more importantly I would like to share with this group two quick stories because I think they embellish the Woody Hayes legend. He is a legend not only for Columbus, as the gentleman from Ohio mentioned, but from all over the United States. It was at every Christmas he would go, and his wife would verify this, he would leave Christmas Day or the day before Christmas looking for hitchhikers, particularly servicemen, and wherever they happened to want to go, Woody would drive them home.

□ 1140

I had the pleasure of speaking to a young man from Louisville, KY, who said he was picked up at the Air Force Base, and asked if I knew a professor named W.W. Hayes. He had given him a ride home, all the way to Louisville, KY, over 170 miles one way, just to get him home so he could be home for Christmas with his family.

Woody was a legend. He came down to my district several times and worked for me. I never will forget at one fundraiser where he spoke to a 48-year-old businessman who was one of his football players, Bill Wilkes, from Hamilton, OH, and said, "Bill, put that cigarette out." Wilkes did it immediately.

Woody Hayes was more than a legend; he was really a built-in father for anyone who played ball and for any human being who ever knew him.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, he had great intensity, but great love for his players. His players have great love for him.

Columbus, OH, will never see another man like Woody Hayes. He is one of the true giants, not only of the sports world, but among men.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1505) making technical corrections relating to the Federal Employees' Retirement System, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would like to respectfully

request that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] explain the nature of the legislation.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been cleared by the minority.

Mr. Speaker, subsection (a) of H.R. 1505 corrects a technical error in section 302(a)(1)(D)(II) of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986. As enacted, that provision inadvertently fails to provide benefits to the survivors of certain employees who elect to transfer from the Civil Service Retirement System [CSRS] to the new Federal Employees' Retirement System [FERS] during the open season beginning in July of this year.

The specific class of employees who would be adversely affected by the current statutory language are those employees who have at least 5, but less than 10, years of service under the CSRS and who die within 18 months of transferring to the FERS. If such event occurred, the surviving spouse and children of the deceased employee would not be entitled to any survivor benefits under either retirement system. Clearly, such an illogical and harsh result was not intended by the committee or the Congress.

The amendment made by subsection (a) of the bill corrects the error by providing that prior creditable service under the CSRS will be creditable for purposes of satisfying the 18-month service requirement for surviving spouse and children's benefits under the FERS.

Subsection (b) of H.R. 1505 corrects a technical error in 5 U.S.C. 8432(b)(4)(A), as added by the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986. As enacted, that provision inadvertently precludes certain employees from participating in the thrift savings plan established by the FERS until January 1, 1988. The employees affected, generally, are those who were automatically covered by the FERS on January 1, 1987, but who had not had the CSRS retirement contributions withheld from their pay during 1984, 1985, or 1986.

As a general rule, a FERS employee is not eligible to participate in the thrift savings plan until the second election period after becoming subject to the FERS. In effect, an individual must be employed at least 6 months before being eligible to participate in the thrift savings plan. This requirement negates the necessity of establishing thrift savings plan accounts for extremely short-term employees. The committee and the Congress intended that employees hired prior to the establishment of the FERS who were automatically swept under its coverage on January 1, 1987, would not have to

wait until the second election period—beginning January 1, 1988—to begin making thrift savings plan contributions. The amendment made by subsection (b) ensures that all such employees will be able to begin thrift savings plan participation on April 1, 1987.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1505

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 302(a)(1)(D)(II) of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335; 100 Stat. 602) is amended by striking out "8442(b)(1)(B)," and inserting in lieu thereof "8442(b)(1), 8443(a)(1)."

(b) The first sentence of section 8432(b)(4)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding paragraph (2)(A), an employee or Member who is an employee or Member on January 1, 1987, and continues as an employee or Member without a break in service through April 1, 1987, may make the first election for the purpose of subsection (a) during the election period prescribed for such purpose by the Executive Director."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 17.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 18.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ACKERMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

Mr. McKINNEY.

Mr. ROTH.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ACKERMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1987, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

851. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the review conducted by the Department of the implementation of the maximum payment limitation provided for in section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended; also a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the fair and equitable application of the maximum limitation on farm program payments that may be received by a person, pursuant to Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591; to the Committee on Agriculture.

852. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the total number of applications for conditional registration of certain pesticides for the fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 136w-4; to the Committee on Agriculture.

853. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 100-48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

854. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of March 1, 1987, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 100-49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

855. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of notice of final funding priorities—research in education of the handicapped—biennial, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

856. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to make technical corrections and program improvements, to remedy operational problems, to reduce unnecessary costs and program abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

857. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, jointly, with the President, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the 10th and last annual report and the 7th one issued jointly, on progress achieved and work in progress with respect to the completion of the Northeast corridor improvement project which summarizes and highlights the major accomplishments during fiscal year 1985, pursuant to Public Law 94-210, section 703(1)(D); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

858. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a listing of the defense articles, services, and training provided to Chad by the Department of Defense as of March 6, 1987, under the authority of Presidential Determination 87-5, dated December 16, 1986 (Ex. Com. No. 88), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

859. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the 12th annual report of the Commission's activities for the calendar year 1986 under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

860. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report of the Bank's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control systems in effect during the year ended December 31, 1986, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

861. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add a representative of Indian tribal governments to the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

862. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the General Accounting Office report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. William A. Cassity to be relieved of liability for repayment in relocation expense reimbursements that were erroneously paid to him by the Department of the Navy, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3702(d); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

863. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of the agency's progress and continuing efforts to date in the implementation of the new Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

864. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of management of public building; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Government Operations.

865. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend coverage under the Social Security Act to railroad employment; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 568. A bill to establish the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area in Cochise County, AZ, in order to assure paleontological, scientific, cultural, educational, and recreational resources of the conservation area, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 100-24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 1580. A bill to prohibit investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Public Works and Transportation, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1581. A bill to delay the increase in the current year liability test for estimated tax purposes, to authorize the waiver of estimated tax penalties in certain cases, to change the date on which withholding certificates are required to take effect, and to revise the estimated tax provisions applicable to corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1582. A bill to enforce the guarantees of the 1st, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States by prohibiting certain devices used to deny the right to participate in certain elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 1583. A bill to establish the Bipartisan Commission on the Consolidation of Military Bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HAYES of

Illinois, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a limitation on the rates of interest which may be imposed on credit card accounts, to provide that such limitation shall take effect on October 1, 1988, unless the determination is made that such rates reflect the cost of funds to creditors and competition among creditors for new credit card accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. GUARINI):

H.R. 1585. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to improve congressional oversight of programs in the President's budget treated in a manner designed to conceal the existence or scope of the program (commonly referred to as black programs); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 1586. A bill to improve congressional oversight of defense programs treated in a manner designed to conceal the existence or scope of the program (commonly referred to as black programs); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Government Operations.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:

H.R. 1587. A bill to authorize the States to prohibit the export of unprocessed logs harvested from lands owned or administered by States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 1588. A bill authorizing the President to issue a posthumous commission of brigadier general to Lt. Col. Charles E. Young, U.S. Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 1589. A bill to increase Government economy and improve efficiency and to reduce the deficit by implementing certain recommendations of the President's private sector survey on cost control relating to the consolidation of certain Department of Defense operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1590. A bill to provide a one-time amnesty from criminal and civil tax penalties for taxpayers who notify the Internal Revenue Service of previous underpayments of Federal tax and pay such underpayments in full with interest, and to provide that the revenues from such payments shall be used to reduce the Federal deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the deduction of medical expenses incurred for certain abortions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1592. A bill to increase Government economy and efficiency and to reduce the deficit by implementing certain recommendations of the President's private sector survey on cost control regarding the consolidation of border management and the revision of overtime laws for inspectors, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Agriculture.

By Mr. FIELDS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SHUMWAY):

H.R. 1593. A bill providing for the orderly and timely development of critical energy resources on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 1594. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on flecainide acetate to January 1, 1992; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend title V of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to allow adjustments in a manufacturer's fleet average fuel economy for automobiles made by the manufacturer which utilize nonpetroleum-based fuels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DYSON, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1596. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to create two divisions in the judicial district of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mrs. KENNELLY):

H.R. 1597. A bill to recognize and grant a Federal Charter to the Franco-American War Veterans, Inc. to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself and Mr. NIELSON of Utah):

H.R. 1598. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Western Historic Trails Center in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 1599. A bill to promote the interests of consumers and to ensure that the free flow of products in interstate commerce is not impeded by product liability law, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 1600. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to display the flag of the United States of America at the apex of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to improve the procedures for the conduct of corporate tender offers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide capital punishment for first degree murders committed by prisoners serving a life sentence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 1603. A bill to encourage innovation, promote research and development, and stimulate trade by strengthening intellectual property laws; to safeguard American business interests abroad by establishing United States negotiating objectives designed to increase intellectual property right protections under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Government Operations.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to require that mandatory income withholding of court-ordered child support begin automatically when the court order is issued, to strengthen the presently required State guidelines for child support award amounts, to require that employment security information be made available for child support enforcement purposes through Federal and State telecommunications networks, and to increase the penalties on States telecommunications networks, and to increase the penalties on States for failure to comply with statutorily prescribed procedures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws," enacted September 2, 1965, and the Flood Control Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 1606. A bill to achieve the highest possible level of efficiency and cost effectiveness within the Federal Government by requiring the Federal Government to enter into contracts with the private sector for performance of commercial activities when any cost comparison demonstrates that the cost of a contract for a commercial activity is lower than the cost of performance of the activity by the Government and by establishing in the procurement policy of the Federal Government a greater reliance on private sector sources to provide property and services needed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. MAVROULES):

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend title 15 of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. VOLKMER (for himself and Mr. GRANDY):

H.R. 1608. A bill to clarify the administration of the feed grain crop acreage base provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish school-based adolescent health services demonstration projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 1610. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide technical assistance to State and local governments to encourage the incorporation of radon testing requirements in building codes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1987, as "World Food Day"; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DORNAN of California):

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of the Congress to President Virgilio Barco and the people of Colombia for their efforts to combat drug trafficking and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution calling for the complete withdrawal of all Vietnamese Armed Forces from Cambodia, and expressing support for the right of self-determination for the Cambodian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. ARCHER):

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of a private initiative established for the purpose of enhancing small business access to U.S. trade laws; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H. Res. 121. Resolution to commend the European Community and the governments of the member states of the European Community for the role which the Community has played in the development of the close relationship existing between the United States and Europe on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DORNAN of California introduced a bill (H.R. 1611) for the relief of Joseph W. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 317: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 637: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 719: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 720: Mr. CRANE and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 778: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 779: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. GEKAS,

Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 790: Mr. MACK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 799: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 898: Mr. FROST, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.R. 921: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 934: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1002: Mr. WALGREN and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1152: Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SHARP, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ROE, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1163: Mr. McGRATH, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1178: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1249: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 1293: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 1356: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 1433: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1437: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1438: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1469: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WORTLEY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. CRAIG.

H. Res. 40: Mr. LOTT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 68: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. HEFNER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1153: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DYSON, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. UDALL.